



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILED DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/573,839	08/16/90	FREJBORG	F 226-8

EXAMINER
MILLARD, W

ART UNIT
1306

8

NIXON & VANDERHIE
1100-NORTH GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

DATE MAILED: 06/16/92

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 03/17/92 05/22/92 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. 6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

[29-31, see below]

1. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15, 17-28 and 32 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims 29-31 are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims 2, 5 and 16 have been cancelled.

3. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15, 17-19, 23-28 and 32 are allowed.

4. Claims 20-22 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable. not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 O.G. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 1306

A. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15, 17-19, 23-28 and 32 are allowable over the prior art of record.

B. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in §102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsections (f) or (g) of §102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

C. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Jameson et al.

Jameson et al. disclose a method of manufacturing a screen plate to be used in a screening process comprising the steps of forming openings in a first face through to the openings in the first face leaving ridges, as recited in instant claim 20.

Jameson et al. also disclose the groove having a contoured face (instant claim 21), with openings being formed in the bottom of a groove (instant claim 22).

D. Applicants' arguments filed March 17, 1992 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Art Unit 1306

Applicants argue that Jameson et al. does not disclose the method manufacture of a screening plate. It is however pointed out, that the instant invention contemplates a method of manufacture of a "screen" plate which is to be used with another plate for a filter operation. Jameson et al. disclose the use of inner and outer perforated cages which have appropriately grooved and apertured surfaces. Dependent upon the direction of flow at least one of which would perform a pre-filter function.

E. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE (3) MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO (2) MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE (3) MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX (6) MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

F. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to W. L. Millard at telephone number (703) 308-0457.

Millard/my1
June 01, 1992

Millard

Robert A. Dawson

ROBERT A. DAWSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 136